UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/892,204	06/26/2001	Edward A. Green	50000-00011	9327

				EXAMINER
25231	7590	12/17/2004		YUAN, ALMARI ROMERO

MARSH, FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP
3151 SOUTH VAUGHN WAY
SUITE 411
AURORA, CO 80014

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/892,204	GREEN ET AL
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Almari Yuan	2176

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>15 January 2002</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>26 June 2001</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>01/15/02</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Application filed on 6/26/01 and IDS filed

on 01/15/02.

2.   Claims 1-32 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 14, 18, 21, and 25 are independent

claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

3.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 01/15/02 has been considered

by the Examiner.

Specification

4.   The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains reference numbers in

parenthesis, i.e. SOLx system (1700).

        Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6.   **Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Davis et al.**

(USPN 6,829,759 B1 – filed 10/1999).

Regarding independent claim 21, Davis discloses:

A method for use in transforming information between first and second different semantic

environments, said first semantic environment differing from said second semantic environment

with respect to one of linguistics and syntax relating to the subject matter under consideration

(Davis on col. 5, lines 20-24 and lines 37-40 teaches translation of language file from first device

to another device), said method comprising the steps of:

obtaining input information in a first form reflecting said first semantic environment (on

col. 7, lines 7-15 teaches loading files to be translated by the translation tool);

using a computer-based processing tool (on col. 7, lines 7-15 teaches translation tool) to

generate processed information, said processed information including first content corresponding

to said input information and second content, provided by said computer-based processing tool,

regarding a context of a portion of said first content for use in transforming said input

information between said first and second semantic environments (on col. 5, lines 20-40 teaches

the translation system may convert language file for one device into a language file of another

device; on col. 7, lines 7-33 teaches translation tool and accessing translation files to be

reanalyzed and retranslated); and

converting said processed information into a second form reflecting said second semantic

environment (col. 5, lines 20-40 teaches converting language file to another language file).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   **Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et**

al. (USPN 6,829,759 B1 – filed 10/1999) in view of Chiu et al. (USPN 6,035,121 – filed

07/1997).

Regarding independent claim 1, Davis discloses:

A method for use in facilitating electronic communication between first and second user systems

that operate in first and second different semantic environments, said first semantic environment

differing from said second semantic environment with respect to at least one of linguistics and

syntax relating to the subject matter of an electronic communication under consideration (Davis

on col. 5, lines 20-24 and lines 37-40 teaches translation of language file from first device to

another device), said method comprising the steps of:

   providing a computer-based processing tool operating on a computer system (Davis on

col. 7, lines 7-15 teaches translation tool);

   accessing via said computer system a first quantity of information reflecting said first

semantic environment of said first user system, said quantity of information defining a first

database (Davis on col. 3, lines 54-60 teaches data storage including data files and on col. 5,

lines 20-40 and on col. 7, lines 7-15 teaches loading files to be translated by the translation tool);

identify a set of semantic elements that at least partially define said first semantic environment (Davis on col. 5, lines 58-60 teaches the parser identifies source elements and on col. 6, lines 22-32 teaches source elements identified by the analyzer to be translated into translation elements);

accessing a second quantity of information reflecting said first semantic environment, said second quantity of information relating to said electronic communication under consideration (Davis on col. 7, lines 25-33 teaches accessing translation files);

second operating said computer-based processing tool to process said second quantity of information relative to said identified set of semantic elements so as to convert at least a portion of said second quantity of information into a semantic environment, thereby providing one or more converted semantic elements (Davis on col. 5, lines 20-40 teaches the translation system may convert language file for one device into a language file of another device; on col. 7, lines 7-33 teaches translation tool and accessing translation files to be reanalyzed and retranslated); and

using said converted semantic elements to process said electronic communication under consideration (Davis on col. 6, lines 21-26 teaches translation elements).

However, Davis does not explicitly disclose "convert portion of first document into third semantic environment".

Davis translation system is capable of translating a language file from a first device into a different language file from a second device (on col. 5, lines 20-40). Furthermore, Davis discloses the translation tool loading translation machine description for the source and targets devices (col. 7, lines 7-15).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the translation of files for multiple target devices incorporated as the third semantic environment in order to enhance the translation environment via network.

However, Davis does not explicitly disclose "computer-based processing tool using said database".

Chiu discloses translation tool supplied with the resource database, on col. 6, lines 46-47.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Chiu into Davis to provide a translation tool that uses the resource database, as taught by Chiu, incorporated into the data store of Davis, in order to enhance the translation system to translate one language to another language.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Davis discloses "files from the first user system", on col. 5, lines 20-40 teaches language file from first device.

Regarding dependent claim 3, Davis discloses "quantity information includes an order form or other business form", on col.6, line 50 teaches information represented by a form.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Davis discloses "content of said database is parsed into first number of objects and semantic elements includes second number of elements, where first number is different than said second number", on col. 5, lines 58-60 teaches a parser generates a list of source elements and on col. 6, lines 21-29 teaches translation elements converted from source elements.

Regarding dependent claim 5, Davis discloses "analyzing a content of said database to provide a set of objects and defining the semantic elements based on the objects", on col. 7, lines 7-33 teaches analyzing source and target files and identifying source elements to perform translation.

Regarding dependent claim 6, Davis discloses "minimized set that encompasses all of the objects of the set of objects, said minimized set having a first number of semantic elements that is less than a second number of objects of said set of objects", on col. 3, line 60 – col. 4, line 4 teaches specifying objects from source elements.

Regarding dependent claim 7, Davis discloses "set of objects includes a first object and a second object, where each of said first and second objects corresponds to one semantic element of said set of semantic elements ", on col. 3, line 60 – col. 4, line 4 teaches objects corresponds to the source elements to be translated.

Regarding dependent claim 8, Davis discloses "different computer systems", on col. 5, lines 20-40 teaches translation operation can be performed on different devices.

Regarding dependent claim 9, Davis discloses "the third semantic environment is different than the first and second semantic environments", on col. 5, lines 20-40 teaches the translation system may convert language file for one device into a language file of another device and on col. 7, lines 25-33 teaches the translation files can be reanalyzed and retranslated.

Regarding dependent claim 10, Davis discloses "third semantic environment is defined by a standardized lexicon and standardized syntax rules relating to the subject matter of electronic communication under consideration, on col. 9, line 61 – col. 10, line 6 teaches translation rules.

Regarding dependent claim 11, Davis discloses "translating said converted semantic elements from one language into another", on col. 5, lines 20-40 teaches translation form one language file to another language file.

Regarding dependent claims 12-13, Davis discloses "converted elements reduces and increases

the total number of elements involved", on col. 6, lines 53-58 teaches elements in the source file

and translation files are aligned to determine association.

9.   **Claims 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis**

et al. (USPN 6,829,759 B1 – filed 10/1999).

Regarding independent claim 14, Davis discloses:

A method for use in facilitating electronic communication between first and second user systems

that operate in first and second different semantic environments, said first semantic environment

differing from said second semantic environment with respect to at least one of linguistics and

syntax relating to the subject matter of an electronic communication under consideration (Davis

on col. 5, lines 20-24 and lines 37-40 teaches translation of language file from first device to

another device) , said method comprising the steps of:

        providing a computer-based processing tool operating on a computer system (Davis on

col. 7, lines 7-15 teaches translation tool);

        first using said computer-based processing tool to access said communication reflecting

said first semantic environment (Davis on col. 5, lines 20-40 and on col. 7, lines 7-15 teaches

loading files to be translated by the translation tool) and convert at least a portion of said first

document into a semantic environment that is different from both said first semantic environment

and said second semantic environment (Davis on col. 5, lines 20-40 teaches the translation

system may convert language file for one device into a language file of another device; on col. 7,

lines 25-33 teaches translation tool and accessing translation files to be reanalyzed and

retranslated);

second using said converted portion of said first document to process said electronic

communication under consideration (Davis on col. 6, lines 21-26 teaches translation elements).

However, Davis does not explicitly disclose "convert portion of first document into third

semantic environment".

Davis translation system is capable of translating a language file from a first device into a

different language file from a second device (on col. 5, lines 20-40). Furthermore, Davis

discloses the translation tool loading translation machine description for the source and targets

devices (col. 7, lines 7-15).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to provide the translation of files for multiple target devices incorporated as

the third semantic environment in order to enhance the translation environment via network.

Regarding dependent claim 15, Davis discloses "third semantic environment is defined by a

standardized lexicon and standardized syntax rules relating to the subject matter of electronic

communication under consideration, on col. 9, line 61 – col. 10, line 6 teaches translation rules.

Regarding dependent claim 16, Davis discloses "analyzing a content of said database to

provide a set of objects and defining the semantic elements based on the objects", on col. 7, lines

7-33 teaches analyzing source and target files and identifying source elements to perform

translation.

Regarding dependent claim 17, Davis discloses "quantity information includes an order form

or other business form", on col. 6, line 50 teaches information represented by a form.

10.   **Claims 18-20 and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable**

over Davis et al. (USPN 6,829,759 B1 – filed 10/1999) in view DeRose et al. (USPN 6,546,406

B1 – filed 11/1998).

Regarding independent claim 18, Davis discloses:

A method for use in standardizing electronic business content relating to a given subject matter,

comprising the steps of:

first providing a computer-based analysis tool (Davis on col. 7, lines 7-15 teaches

translation tool) ;

second providing a database of information reflecting a first semantic environment

(Davis on col. 3, lines 54-60 teaches data storage including data files);

first using said computer-based processing tool to parse content of the database into a set

of chunks (Davis on col. 3, lines 54-60 teaches data storage including data files and on col. 5,

lines 20-40; on col. 7, lines 7-15 teaches loading files to be translated by the translation tool);

and on col. 5, lines 58-60 teaches the parser) and provide a user interface that can be used to

select specific ones of said chunks for processing (Davis on col. 7, lines 25-33 teaches translation

files displayed on the user interface to reviewed by the user);

second using said computer-based processing tool for defining a standardized semantic

environment including a set of standardized semantic elements (Davis on col. 7, lines 7-33

teaches using translation tool).

However, Davis does not explicitly disclose "map selected chunk to a standardized semantic element" and "set of chunks are mapped into said set of standardized semantic elements".

DeRose discloses the conversion of different languages and using a mapping table to map elements from one markup language to elements of another markup language (on col. 5, lines 1-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified DeRose into Davis to provide a way to map elements from the conversion of languages, as taught by DeRose, incorporated into the translation system of Davis, in order to simplify the translation process between markup languages.

Regarding dependent claims 19-20, Davis discloses "using said user interface to graphically represent a status relative", on col. 7, lines 25-33 teaches user interface to display translation files to the user for review.

DeRose discloses mapping elements from one markup language to elements of another markup language (on col. 5, lines 1-35).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified DeRose into Davis to provide a way to map elements from the conversion of languages, as taught by DeRose, incorporated into the translation system of Davis, in order to simplify the translation process between markup languages.

Regarding dependent claims 22-24, DeRose discloses "tags", on col. 8, lines 48-65 teaches tags associated with elements.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified DeRose into Davis to provide a way to map elements from

the conversion of languages, as taught by DeRose, incorporated into the translation system of

Davis, in order to simplify the translation process between markup languages.

11.   **Claims 25-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis**

et al. (USPN 6,829,759 B1 – filed 10/1999) in view of Horiguchi et al. (USPN 6,330,530 B1 –

filed 10/1999).

Regarding independent claim 25 and (claims 26-29), Davis discloses:

A method for use in transforming information for exchange between first and second user

systems that operate in first and second different semantic environments, said first semantic

environment differing from said second semantic environment with respect to one of linguistics

and syntax relating to the subject matter under consideration (Davis on col. 5, lines 20-24 and

lines 37-40 teaches translation of language file from first device to another device) said method

comprising the steps of:

        providing a computer-based tool having access to a knowledge base reflecting one of said

first and second semantic environments (Davis on col. 7, lines 7-15 teaches translation tool);

        accessing a communication for transmission between said first and second user systems,

said communication having a content reflecting one of said first and second semantic

environments (Davis on col. 5, lines 20-40 teaches the translation system may convert language

file for one device into a language file of another device);

operating said computer-based tool to transform said content relative to a source semantic

environment of said communication, thereby providing transformed content (Davis on col. 7,

lines 7, lines 7-33 teaches translation tool to translate source file into translation file);

transmitting said communication between said first and second user systems (Davis on

col. 3, lines 30-32 teaches computer network for communication between devices (col. 5, lines

37-40));

wherein said computer-based tool allows transformation of communications between said

first and second user systems (Davis on col. 5, lines 20-33 teaches translation between devices

and on col. 7, lines 7-33 teaches using the translation tool to translate between source and target

devices).

However, Davis does not explicitly disclose "real-time transformation".

Horiguchi discloses real-time transformation between languages, on col. 1, lines 9-23.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to have modified Horiguchi into Davis to provide a real-time transformation

between languages, as taught by Horiguchi, incorporated into the translation system of Davis, in

order to enhance the transformation system for business between countries.

Regarding dependent claim 30, Davis does not explicitly disclose "transform the

communication into third semantic environment", however, discloses a translation system is

capable of translating a language file from a first device into a different language file from a

second device (on col. 5, lines 20-40). Furthermore, Davis discloses the translation tool loading

translation machine description for the source and targets devices (col. 7, lines 7-15).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the translation of files for multiple target devices incorporated as the third semantic environment in order to enhance the translation environment via network.

Regarding dependent claim 31, Davis discloses "tool for translating a least portions of the communication", on col. 7, lines 7-33 teaches translation tool.

Regarding dependent claim 32, Davis discloses "database of objects" col. 3, lines 54-60 teaches data storage including data files.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Almari Yuan whose telephone number is 571-272-4104. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays - Fridays (8:30am - 5:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AY
December 12, 2004

/JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER